



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,426	02/22/2002	Petri Koskelainen	1135.41220X00	7008

20457 7590 10/19/2005

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/079,426	KOSKELAINEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas R. Taylor	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 60-89 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 60-89 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 60-89 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/21/2005 with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 60-63, 66, 68, 70, 72-77, 80, 82, 84, and 86-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (US PGPub 2003/0212800) and Nguyen et al. (US PGPub 2003/0005132).

5. As per claims 60 and 74, Jones teaches a method for provisioning services to a terminal, which terminal is adapted to perform communication via at least one communication network, (Jones, paragraphs 0023-0028, 0060-0061, figure 2) comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2141

requesting, by said terminal, a specified service to be at a disposition of said requesting terminal; (Jones, figure 2, block 34)

analyzing said request by an analyzing entity associated with said at least one communication network;

deciding, by said analyzing entity, that said requested specified service is associated a service processing entity of a specific one of said at least one communication network; and (Jones, figure 2, blocks 36-44 and figure 3, items 114 and 118)

in response to said decision, routing communication messages associated with said terminal via said analyzing entity to said specified service processing entity within said specified communication network (Jones, figure 2, block 48 to end).

However, Jones fails to teach multiple service processing entities within each network to specifically select among. Nguyen teaches a network with multiple service processing entities selectable for communication within the network (Nguyen, paragraphs 0029-0030 and figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Jones and Nguyen to provide the multiple services of Nguyen in the system of Jones, because doing so would enable multiple services in each network of Jones, and would also decrease management and maintenance requirements while improving scalability (Nguyen, paragraph 0007).

6. As per claims 61 and 75, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein requesting said specified service comprises indicating said specified service in a request message (Jones, paragraph 0022).

7. As per claims 62 and 76, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein said specified service is indicated by a service identifier carried in said request message (Jones, paragraph 0022).

8. As per claims 63 and 77, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein said identifier is carried in the user data payload in said request message (Jones, paragraph 0022).

9. As per claims 66 and 80, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein said request message comprises at least a subscriber identifier (Jones, paragraph 0022).

10. As per claims 68 and 82, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein said service identifier comprises a network code and/or a service code (Jones, paragraph 0062).

11. As per claims 70 and 84, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein said network code represents a respective one of said communication networks (Jones, paragraph 0062).

12. As per claims 72 and 86, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein said communication networks are distinguishable by at least one of the network type and/or the network operator (Jones, paragraph 0026, wherein communications are handled specific to the network type).

13. As per claims 73 and 87, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein said services are distinguishable by at least one of the terminal type, subscriber identifier, subscriber profiles, manufacturer of the terminal, capabilities of the terminal or vendor of the terminal (Jones, paragraph 0022.)

14. As per claims 88 and 89, Jones-Nguyen teaches the system further wherein said request message is transported using the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) (Jones, paragraphs 0039, 0047, 0048).

15. Claims 64, 65, 71, 78, 79, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (US PGPub 2003/0212800) and Nguyen et al. (US PGPub 2003/0005132), further in view of Davis et al. (US PGPub 2003/0041146).

16. As per claims 64 and 78, Jones-Nguyen teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein the identifier is carried in a header of said request message.

Davis teaches a connection allocation method (Davis, paragraph 0019) that uses service codes representing services via message headers (Davis, paragraph 0049 & 0052, figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Jones-Nguyen and Davis to provide the service code headers of Davis in the system of Jones-Nguyen, because doing so would allow intelligent and high speed connection decisions providing enhanced network services (Davis, paragraph 0018).

17. As per claims 65 and 79, Jones-Nguyen teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein the identifier is piggybacked to the header.

Davis teaches a connection allocation method (Davis, paragraph 0019) that uses service codes representing services via message headers (Davis, paragraph 0049 & 0052, figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Jones-Nguyen and Davis to provide the service code headers of Davis in the system of Jones-Nguyen, because doing so would allow intelligent and high speed connection decisions providing enhanced network services (Davis, paragraph 0018).

18. As per claim 71, Jones-Nguyen teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein the service code represents a respective one of the services to be processed at the corresponding service processing entity.

Davis teaches a connection allocation method (Davis, paragraph 0019) that uses service codes representing services via message headers (Davis, paragraph 0049 & 0052, figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Jones-Nguyen and Davis to provide the service code headers of Davis in the system of Jones-Nguyen, because doing so would allow intelligent and high speed connection decisions providing enhanced network services (Davis, paragraph 0018).

19. As per claim 85, Jones-Nguyen teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein the service code represents a respective one of the services to be processed at the corresponding service processing entity.

Davis teaches a connection allocation method (Davis, paragraph 0019) that uses service codes representing services via message headers (Davis, paragraph 0049 & 0052, figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Jones-Nguyen and Davis to provide the service code headers of Davis in the system of Jones-Nguyen, because doing so would allow intelligent and high speed connection decisions providing enhanced network services (Davis, paragraph 0018).

20. Claims 67, 69, 81, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (US PGPub 2003/0212800) and Nguyen et al. (US PGPub 2003/0005132), further in view of Glitho et al. (US Patent 6,687,356).

21. As per claims 67 and 81, Jones-Nguyen teaches the above, yet fails to teach:
detecting that said request message does not comprise a service identifier; and
in response thereto, retrieving said service identifier based on said subscriber
identifier from a database entity

Glitho teaches retrieving service identifiers based on subscriber identifiers from a
database entry (Glitho, column 4, lines 50-58). It would have been obvious to one of
ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Jones-
Nguyen and Glitho to provide the identifier services of Glitho in the system of Jones-
Nguyen, because doing so would enable a robust, device-aware service provisioning
solution (Glitho, column 2, lines 24-29).

22. As per claims 69 and 83, Jones-Nguyen-Glitho teaches the system further
wherein said service identifier comprises a network code and/or a service code (Jones,
paragraph 0062).

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in
this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2141

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Taylor
Examiner
Art Unit 2141


RUPAL DHABIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER